

No. 16 Sept. 1967

Spearhead

one-shilling

ADEN



**HOW MANY
MORE?**

EDITORIAL

Offices:-

The Nationalist Centre
Birkbeck Hill
London S.E.21

Editor
JOHN TYNDALL

How Many More?

THE death roll in Aden is the shame of a craven government.

There is always tragedy in the sight of young men being cut down in the prime of life, but it is a tragedy most of us accept where national necessity offers no other way out. In the case of Aden, as with Cyprus before it and Suez before that, it amounts to the squandering of life in a cause that has been made utterly pointless.

Our Government has long ago decided to scuttle from Aden.

Deplorable though this decision may be, once it has been made not another life should be lost in its postponement. Our Government, however, cherishes the sweet illusion that it can withdraw and at the same time leave a pro-British regime behind. In the pursuit of this illusion British lives have to be lost.

That itself would be bad enough. But at least it would be some comfort to our troops to know that the Government stood determinedly behind them in their efforts to resist the forces of terror. What kind of comfort are they in fact getting?

After the appalling Crater massacre our men were ready to employ the full armour at their disposal to stamp the culprits out in double quick time. But an order came back to them from Whitehall not to use any heavier weapons than general purpose machine guns. The reason? Offence must not be given to the Arabs at the time when they are accusing Britain of intervening in the Middle Eastern war!

Was that the end? Oh no! Three weeks later a march past was arranged featuring the very unit of the Arab police that mutinied and took part in the massacre. A British General took the salute and later joined the mutineers for tea. This was subsequently acknowledged by a Ministry of Defence spokesman as a political decision, made with the aim of reconciling the police in order that they may "assume wider responsibility after Britain's withdrawal."

WIDER RESPONSIBILITY!

To those who may doubt the authenticity of this quotation we advise a check with the Ministry. These days the unbelievable is as often as not true.

Is it any wonder that Britain today is the object of utter contempt among the lowest as well as the highest nations? We deserve no other fate when our leaders go crawling to the murderers of their own young men in the way this Government has done continually in recent times.

We are entitled to ask: how many more must fall before the curtain ends the farce?

Lesson from America

The whole world has been appalled at the orgy of rioting and looting that has marked the past few weeks of the American race war.

On the Left there is the inclination to load all the blame onto America's whites. If they hadn't maintained white supremacy, so the argument goes, the blacks would be content, and would never have resorted to violence.

On the Right there is less willingness to excuse negro behaviour, and all the more adherence to the view that such behaviour betokens an unfitness for civic responsibility.

But both Left and Right are unanimous on one point: **WE DON'T WANT IT TO HAPPEN HERE!**

Britain shows every sign of having to contend with a similar problem in the years to come, but in one respect the problem differs fundamentally from that in the United States. Our negro question is not an inheritance from early history, forced upon this generation by the choice of former ones. It is something which this generation is creating of its own free will and with its eyes wide open. The problem in America is perhaps inevitable. Here there is not the slightest need for it!

Left and Right may disagree on general questions of race. But surely Left and Right MUST agree on the insanity of creating a social time-bomb with all the destructive potency that we see across the Atlantic — in a country where none previously existed. Whether, like the Left, you are concerned for the welfare of the blacks, or whether, as with the Right, you feel your main duty is to your fellow whites, you will surely agree that such a holocaust must be prevented.

And that can only mean one thing: **NO to a multi-racial Britain!**

New Canadian Emblem

Recently we received at our office a letter from Canada with a most odd kind of post-mark on the envelope. Purporting to signify Canada's centenary year, the post-mark includes the sign reproduced here to the left. Presumably it is supposed to represent a maple-leaf, but one glance at it should suffice to establish a resemblance much closer to that of the Jewish Star of David.



This is not the first time Canada has featured in acts of symbolism. Only a while ago her Premier, Lester Pearson, moved an act through the Canadian Parliament by which the Union Jack was eliminated from Canada's flag, so destroying the symbol of her historical connection with Britain. This was explained as a sign of Canada's 'maturing nationhood' — an odd explanation, since Pearson is known to be an avowed internationalist. Can we assume that, having eagerly symbolised Canada's separation from the British Empire, Mr. Pearson regards the next logical step as being to symbolise her attachment to the Jewish Empire? Perhaps Canadian readers can enlighten us on this point.

Ideological Drug?

The disclosure by Beatle Paul McCartney that he has been accustomed to taking the drug, L.S.D., comes as no surprise. On occasions before this journal has drawn attention to the connection between 'beat' music and drugs as twin instruments in the demoralisation of our youth. Quite clearly, the stage antics of the beat-musicians have their source in some unnatural stimulus that removes all normal human self-restraint. It

what

is to be expected that such drugs as L.S.D. provide this stimulus.

Two aspects of this particular affair, however, are especially frightening.

In the first place the McCartney disclosures were published on the front page of THE PEOPLE, a widely read national newspaper. The publishers of this newspaper must know that millions of young people throughout both Britain and the world have been taught to hero-worship the Beatles and model their behaviour on them. Did it not occur to THE PEOPLE that such headline publicity would only encourage the taking of L.S.D. by those millions?

This is especially so in view of what THE PEOPLE reported McCartney as saying about the drug. "He believes", said the report, "that if world leaders were to experience it just once it would banish forever the threat of war, poverty, and famine". The drug made McCartney, in his own words, "a more tolerant member of society".

Phew! There is only one meaning that can be attached to such a statement: L.S.D., apart from any physical effects that it may produce in the taker, has the power to decisively influence the mind, and what is more influence it in a definite ideological direction. Whilst none of us want "war, poverty, and famine", we are only too familiar with the jargon of which the derogatory use of those words is part. It is the jargon of the mind-benders of the Left. Has the Left now produced a drug that can positively turn the heads of the young in whatever ideological direction it chooses? And has the Left deliberately encouraged the use of this drug by people who have been made the object of juvenile hero-worship, people who have been turned into 'models' for the thoughts and behaviour of millions of youngsters? Whatever the professed attitude of papers like THE PEOPLE towards the taking of L.S.D. as such, there can be no doubt at all that the front-page spread given to Paul McCartney will have the effect of increasing rather than decreasing the taking of the drug by young worshippers of the Beatles.

And apparently of increasing also the addiction of the young to definite political sentiments!

All Queers' Day

July 4th in Parliament will be remembered as a day conspicuous for its portrayal of the repulsive sickness of the British body-politic.

Amid rousing cheers that might, in healthier times, have been taken to represent the greeting of a great national victory in the field of battle, the now notorious bill legalising homosexuality was passed by the House.

Queers throughout Britain gave a squeal of joy.

Not the least nauseating feature of this bill has been the passion — amounting at times to fanaticism — with which its campaigners have worked for it over the past years. In a previous issue of *SPEARHEAD* we put the microscope over this movement, and examined its sponsors. As might have been expected, they represented as choice a collection of orthodox lefty as could be found

we

anywhere. It will perhaps be no surprise to our readers that among them was included the present Archbishop of Canterbury. To these campaigners the urgency of the Pan-sies' Charter has taken on the aspect of an issue of national survival so intense as to relegate every other public issue of the day to the ranks of irrelevancy.

This intensity has given ground to the very pointed question raised in the House by the member for Selly Oak, Mr. Harold Gurden, as to what personal interests certain M.P.s had in securing the passage of the bill. The laws of libel as they stand provide a very convenient protection for individuals in this respect. None of us dare mention names! However, if we accept the evidence of the queers themselves that they represent 1 in 50 of the population of Britain this allows for a fair likelihood that they are well represented in Parliament. In view of the massive support which their bill obtained there — contrasting as it did vividly with the almost universal contempt in which it has been held by the general public outside — this representation must surely be well above the supposed average.

This journal does not shirk strong language when circumstances call for it. That such a situation can obtain now in the institution which purports to represent the pinnacle of British public life is something that can only deserve one comment: THAT THE SCUM OF THE NATION HAS SOMEHOW BEEN ALLOWED TO DRIFT TO THE TOP RANK, AND THE VALUES THAT IT REPRESENTS SOMEHOW BECOME ACCEPTED AS THE STANDARD NATIONAL VALUES.

For this we can thank only our own apathy. While we ogle at Television and toy around at Bingo the creatures of the moral underworld take over our affairs.

All that is needed for the triumph of evil, etc., etc., etc.



LEO ABSE
Champion of Bill

Buying Votes

It had to come! Harold Wilson's 'Votes at 18' plan should surprise nobody.

To the big question: how many people between 18 and 21 are fit to exercise the vote? one might straightaway answer: how many people over 21 are fit to either? Whether the proposed new electorate would be any more vague and credulous in their exercise of political power than their elders already are is debatable — but that is not the point.

The essential thing to grasp is the motive behind this impending piece of legislation.

Desperately short of even one constructive achievement to mark its period of power, this Government has sought frantically to ingratiate itself in some way with one after another section of the public. In turn it has

think...

courted the favours of criminals, queers, and abortionists, as well as those who consider free medicine more important than national defence. To crawl after the allegiance of the young, most of which could not care less about the new 'rights' that the politicians propose to bestow upon them, is simply the next logical step in the pattern.

The old parties have reduced British politics to a degrading orgy of bribery and back-scratching in which the principle of firm and enlightened leadership has been contemptuously thrown aside. What shape of carrot will best tempt the docile donkey of herd opinion? That has become more important than what measures will restore the political, economic, and moral health of the nation they are supposed to govern.

Racial Solidarity

Among the most vivid features of the Middle Eastern War has been the immense demonstration of solidarity towards Israel on the part of Britain's Jews.

Mass meetings have been held in support of the Israeli cause; huge sums of money have been raised among Jewish businessmen; young volunteers have left Britain to fight.

All this is admirable.

Jewish solidarity with Israel makes it clear where everyone stands. Israel is the Jews' nation. It has first command on their loyalty. This was acknowledged by no less an authority than the Chief Rabbi himself, who at a meeting at the Albert Hall recently condemned newspaper columnist Bernard Levin for affirming that his first allegiance was to Britain, and only secondly to Israel.

No-one can blame the Jews for their racial patriotism. It serves as an excellent example to other peoples, including ourselves.

At the same time it establishes a fact which cannot be ignored. A man cannot have two nations — if by 'nation' we mean the group to which one owes first loyalty. If Israel be the Jews' nation, Britain by the same reckoning cannot be their nation.

Those Jews therefore who have affirmed their prior loyalty to Israel should not be outraged if they are regarded as foreigners by the population of Britain.

At the same time those Britons who have affirmed their race-loyalty towards the Whites in Rhodesia should not be condemned by the press pundits of the Left, least of all those who are Jews.

Conspiracy to Destroy

Air Industry?

In our last issue we spotlighted the devious influences behind the Government's decision to abandon the TSR2 aircraft. At the time we said that what had been disclosed to date was enough to justify a charge of High Treason against the officials concerned. We then said: "the mind boggles at what fresh revelations are likely as more time passes."

Our predictions were not unfounded. Soon afterwards it was disclosed that the Anglo-French variable geometry aircraft which formed part of the replacement for the TSR2 would most likely be cancelled due to French withdrawal.

Now the shattering announcement has come that the Government is preparing to invite a massive American take-over of the British air industry which would leave our factories as nothing more than spare part workshops for firms across the Atlantic.

In this policy the Government has relied upon the advice of a so-called 'air expert', Mr. Richard Worcester. Mr. Worcester, it will be remembered, was the one on whose advice the TSR2 cancellation was embarked upon in the first place. At the present time the precise political affiliations of this man are not known, except that he is reputed to hold far leftist views and to have been associated with prominent members of the Labour Party for many years. What is known is that he has since the early 1950s edited a weekly magazine called 'Aviation Studies', which is said to be chiefly sold in America. As to his claims to expertise in the aviation field, a clue might be gained from his contention in the 1950s that the advent of jet aircraft would bankrupt the airlines.

Just how big a wheel Mr. Worcester is in this whole sordid affair cannot be established at this time. What is becoming increasingly certain, however, is that both he and the present Government are the willing agents of a campaign aimed at destroying the whole British air industry as an effective force, and with it Britain's power to play any kind of free role in the future. Only the most abject simpleton would fail to glean from these events that the decision to cancel the TSR2 was part and parcel of a conspiracy which anticipated the eventual hand-over of the air industry to foreign control.

Now that this intention has been as good as acknowledged, it is possible to piece together the bewildering jig saw puzzle of the past decade or so in which one after another great aircraft project has been launched and then cancelled to the loss of millions of pounds. With each fresh cancellation the word 'bungling' has been on everybody's lips. What we see unveiled now, however, is something worse than that. We have named it Treason, and we stand by that description!

Unity One Step Nearer

WE LINE UP BEHIND NATIONAL FRONT

READERS of this journal will know that as its Editor, and as the Leader of its parent organisation, the Greater Britain Movement, I have for some time now been a consistent exponent of unity among patriotic groups in Britain. Three prominent features that we have published over the last year must have made this clear. In these features we have emphasised again and again that there will never be any effectively organised movement of nationalism in Britain until the resources of splintered nationalist groups are combined together into one party, with a singular discipline and centrally directed will. In this contention we have gone much further than others, who have talked vaguely of 'collaboration' but who have wanted to retain the luxury of having their own separate little groups to represent their own minor little variants of view. Now our aim of a single united nationalist movement is in sight.

In November of last year two of the biggest patriotic organisations in Britain, the League of Empire loyalists and the British National Party combined forces to form the National Front. At the time, due to a number of factors, it was not possible for our own journal and organisation to give their support to this new united body. Nevertheless, we regarded it as a decidedly positive step to the goal at which we had been aiming, and watched its progress while keeping in touch with its leading officers. More recently, this contact has extended into close and serious discussion on ways of combining forces and I am pleased to say that we have now reached agreement on all basic principles.

As the National Front is a considerably more substantially founded organisation than the Greater Britain Movement, being the combination of two groups each larger than our own to begin with, we believe that the most appropriate way of linking forces with it is the very simple one of discontinuing the Greater Britain Movement and calling upon all those who have been members of, or who have in some other way supported, that organisation, to join and put their whole efforts behind the National Front. This we have done, and already most of our leading members have taken the step advised.

Achievements of G.B.M.

The decision that we have made has not been a light one. An immense amount of hard work, dedication, and sacrifice went into the building of the Greater Britain Movement and the allied bodies run in conjunction with it. Its membership size was never very great, but as a political striking force it came to represent something that worried its enemies into acts of violence more organised and more vicious than was accorded in compliment to any other patriotic group. It spectacularly hit national newspaper headlines on more than one occasion. It was the subject of a considerable outburst by a left-wing peer in the House of Lords. During the last year it acquired a new premises with facilities for a great extension of its work, and has been in the process of accumulating printing plant as well.

My own estimation is that, given another year or so, the G.B.M. would have grown to a quite respectable strength. Its financial position, always its greatest weakness, was

beginning to improve; its reputation among patriots, hard won in the first place, was definitely gaining ground.

But this development, although a source of no little pride to us, had to be measured realistically against the vast preponderance of the forces arrayed on the side of our enemies. Against such forces nothing less than a very substantial national party, with resources far beyond those we could expect to employ in the near future, could have any concrete political effect.



N. F. MEMBERS ACTIVE
Seen at H. M. Docks, Chatham

Such a party does not yet exist in Britain, but in the National Front we see the greatest possibility of its coming into existence. By giving our full support to the National Front we can hasten that day.

Example to Splinterers

I very much hope that other small groups and isolated individuals will be guided by what we have done. I know already that there will be people who will object and say that the National Front isn't quite this or isn't quite that, and on the strength of these minor disagreements may want to run off into the wilderness and start tiny splinter groups with absolutely no hope of success. My advice to them is simple and blunt: For heaven's sake don't be bloody fools! There are bound to be disagreements between us, but we are less than men if we do not make an effort to resolve them within the framework of a united body. Just what these mini-parties hope to achieve against all the massed weight of the political establishment cannot be imagined. Our own Greater Britain Movement lasted a lot longer and accomplished far more than any of them are likely to ever do, but we have still recognised the

need to submerge our individualism in a larger united movement if our work is to succeed. As I have said, I hope that these others will be guided by what we have done.

Men Behind N.F.

When a new political movement suddenly comes on the scene people are entitled to ask: who are the men behind it? Will their campaign be a burst of Spring energy later to be followed by the familiar Autumn dampness? We have seen right-wing saviours before, with great plans and hopes that have lasted just as long as it has taken for the first real symptom of adversity to present itself. Will it be different this time?

I believe it will be different this time for the very important reason that, although the National Front as an organisation is new, the men behind it have years of hard experience of the work they are doing. They have proved themselves to be stayers in the nationalist struggle, and that, over the past decade or so, has not always been an easy thing.

At the head of the Policy Directorate of the National Front is A.K. Chesterton, editor of *CANDOUR*, that very expertly informed journal on world affairs, and author of numerous other well known books and pamphlets. Mr. Chesterton has a distinguished record in both world wars, and has been a consistent fighter for the nationalist cause in this country very many years. His latest book, *THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS*, has been acclaimed as one of the finest and most penetrating analyses of the evils besetting Britain and the West ever written.

Another prominent figure in the National Front is John Bean, formerly the chief organiser of the British National Party and the editor of *COMBAT*. Mr. Bean fought as a B.N.P. candidate in Southall during the last election and polled the highest vote of any nationalist candidate since the war.

Apart from these two, there are many other sturdy fighters who have rendered magnificent service to the nationalist cause over many years but whose voices have remained largely unheard because their efforts have been splintered in too many diverse directions and because national conditions have not up till recently amplified the need for a new political alternative in Britain.

Time of Opportunity

Now, with the steadily worsening national situation, and the resulting disillusionment with the old political remedies, this unification of forces has come at exactly the right time. The Right looks like at last having an organisation large enough and strong enough to have a chance of breaking the stranglehold of the old parties on British political life.

That we should give our wholehearted support to such an organisation has been clear to me from the time when it was first conceived. It has merely been a case of when and by what manner of agreement this support should take form. This has required a little negotiation and some spirit of tolerance over the matter of past disagreements. Now the divide has been breached, and what has been longed for over many years has come about: we are one. JOHN TYNDALL

THE GREAT 'AID' FARCE

DENIS PIRIE spotlights a piece of idiocy that is exhausting Britain.


THE farce that masquerades under the name of 'aid' to the backward nations today is inextricably linked with the factors in Britain's decline as a major world power. Not only is the figure of a nation in our financial position throwing its resources to the winds one which causes other nations to doubt our sanity, but the principles upon which this folly is based are those which have contributed most towards the rotting of Britain's moral fibre.

To take the obvious aspects first, Britain is in financial and economic trouble. Many hours of Mr. Wilson's "frank statements to the nation" on T.V. have been spent in expounding this theme. We have restrictions placed on wage-increases, more taxes to pay, stringent limits on how much of our hard earned money we can spend on holidays abroad, and even crisis in the National Health Service, the pride and joy of Wilsonian Socialism. Most of all, we are now told that we must even cut back on the means to defend our very existence as a nation.

While these measures are considered necessary, our Government chooses the same moment to play Santa Claus to the world.

This stupidity may be most immediately dangerous to us in the economic sphere, but in its deeper aspects it affects our existence as a nation in a far more fundamental sense. Behind this sickening pandering to the beggar states of the world lies the masochistic guilt complex of the liberal mind. Who knows what perverted form of satisfaction the liberals get by ostentatiously parading in their sackcloth and ashes, beating their breasts and flagellating themselves (and us) with invited insults. The perverts who gladly shoulder the cross of guilt for imagined crimes against the 'nationhood' of the Babu and the Hottentot refuse of course to bear responsibility for the real harm they do to their own people.

It is shameful and degrading to watch Africans and Asians looking quizzically and perhaps with some embarrassment at the antics of the once respected British Lion. When this mangy parody of our old selves wistfully implores lesser nations to pull its tail in return for cash payments, who can blame them for tantalising the jaded old beast?



This young Londoner, protesting outside the home of the Housing Minister, is one of 3,000 children without homes in their own country.

WHILE
THEY
SHOWER
OUR
MONEY
ABROAD
BRITONS
GO
IN
WANT

Minority

The tragedy is that the perverts who have planned Britain's demise and now gloat over her death-throes form only a tiny proportion of public opinion. In essence the temperament of our people has not changed, but from our midst has sprung a small but fanatical band of zealots bent on transforming their grisly liberal death-wish philosophy into tragic national reality. Their glazed, staring eyes do not wish to see the gaping flaws in their own arguments. As they mechanically mouth their hackneyed slogans

of Love, Equality, Freedom, and Tolerance, they viciously hack down whoever stands in the way of their macabre dream.

Even if one accepted for a moment their preposterous theory that charity begins anywhere but at home, and that the welfare of the backward peoples comes before that of their own, still their theories flounder against reality. If it was our moral duty, or even our national interest, to subsidise the beggar state at the expense of our own, how does one encourage people to stand on their own feet when they are being told all the time that it is our fault that they are in a mess and our responsibility to get them out of it regardless of the cost? And how is it that people who cannot feed, clothe, educate, and economically sustain themselves are nevertheless considered far enough along the road to development to be given all the reins of self-government, independence, etc.?

If the liberal remained true to any consistency of argument his touching concern for the 'underdeveloped' should lead him to support imperialism on the grounds that the humanities can only be best preserved under the superior organisation of the advanced nations. On the other hand, if the liberal really believed in 'independence' for the Afro-Asian peoples, he should be the first to concede that they should qualify for such independence by being capable of looking after themselves without our help.

The liberal hypocrite does not see it this way. He wants to have his cake and eat it as well! For as long as he is allowed to play at his ideological experiments with the life and future of the British people, our country will be denuded even further by the appetite of the voracious vampires whose every greedy fad he must obey. It will be of little consolation to us to know that when the provider of the vampires dies of anaemia they too will die because they will not find anyone else stupid enough to permit their bloodsucking.

No Use

Quite apart from any other considerations, the aid to the backward countries does not fulfill the purpose for which it is supposedly given. Money and materials sent by both Government agencies and sentimental do-gooders is almost invariably siphoned off by graft and corruption at all levels. Witness the exposures of 'emergent' leaders Nkrumah and Sukarno, just to name two! What then

remains of this charity after such potentates have had their fill is further depreciated through incompetent and top-heavy administration. By the time the aid reaches those it is designed to help there is seldom very much left.

But does it help? By absurdly assuming the responsibility of curing problems brought upon the backward states mainly through their own ineptitude, we are in fact stifling their only solution: the development of the will to help themselves and the preparedness to face the consequences of their own actions — the things that are the price and justification of self-government. Britain's puny attempts to bale out a sinking ship with a teaspoon are not helping today's problems and are indeed contributing to the creation of tomorrow's!

Equality Mania

The basic ingredient of the ridiculous aid programme is the blind conceit with which the liberal smugly wishes to impose his ideological values on the whole world. The concept of spiritual equality before God may be a noble one, but this does not justify its being perverted into a materialistic concept which blandly asserts that the capable should for ever be plundered to sustain the incapable. This idea — which is at root a bolshevik idea — betrays an abject ignorance of human nature. If of two people one is prepared to work and strive for self-betterment and the other is not, it serves no good purpose to steal half the earnings of the former to pay the latter! The former will cease to work because there is little incentive to do so, while the latter will certainly not be induced to make an effort because there is no need to do so. 'Equality' will of course be the product in the end. From a 'have' and a 'have-not' will emerge two 'have-nots' — equal in their mutual austerity!

If one seriously wishes to give something to the backward peoples, let it be good example. Let us use our resources to build a strong and respected Britain that may inspire other peoples throughout the world that self-reliance is a principle for which ultimately there is no substitute. The real achievements of a nation that knows where it is going and knows how to look after itself will prove a much better spur to the backward than the grovelling penance that typifies Britain today.

RISE OF THE

THE Arab-Israeli conflict now raging in the Middle East dates back to 1917.

During the First World War the legendary T. E. Lawrence was able to secure the collaboration of most of the Arab leaders in fighting the Turks by means of a pledge, made with the full authority of the British Government, that with the defeat of the Ottoman Empire Britain would guarantee Arab sovereignty over great stretches of Middle Eastern territory, including Palestine, at that time inhabited by 600,000 Arabs and only 65,000 Jews, the former having been settled there since biblical days. As was customary at the time, the word of our Government was taken as its bond. The help of Lawrence's Arab bands contributed greatly to the Turkish defeat.

Some time before the appearance of Lawrence, however, moves had been afoot to break what had become a virtual deadlock on the Western Front. To this end Allied leaders had strenuously sought to enlist the aid of America in the war. Up till 1917 they had been unsuccessful, the sentiment of neutrality being strong in that country and President Wilson having secured office on the firm promise that it would be maintained. To break this neutrality it was necessary to secure the aid of an immensely powerful pressure group in the United States that would use its influence to tip the scales in favour of war.

American Jewry, dominant in high financial circles and already with a strong hold over the opinion media, was the one group powerful enough to carry out this task. And American Jewry was wholeheartedly pledged to Zionism, the movement for the establishment of a Jewish home in Palestine.

* * *

One day in October 1916 a certain Mr. James A. Malcolm visited the home of Sir Mark Sykes, then an Undersecretary to the British Foreign Office. There was discussed the problem of how to get America into the war, and Malcolm, something of an authority on Jewish affairs, advised that the British Government should be induced to support Zionist claims to Palestine in return for American Jewry using its massive weight to lead the war campaign in the United States. That such a deal stood in direct contradiction to all the pledges that Britain had made, and was still yet to make, to the Arabs was conveniently ignored, and official endorsement of the plan was given. It was formally ratified in November 1917 by the now historic Balfour Declaration. The Arabs were utterly betrayed, and so began their long and deep resentment against Britain, and the consequent deterioration in our Middle Eastern influence for which we have suffered to this day.

By 1947 the Jewish element in Palestine

had risen, partly through immigration and partly through the callous uprooting of thousands of Arab families, to 30 per-cent. Zionist leaders rejected the Arab offer of a mixed state, and under U.S. pressure the United Nations awarded about 55 per-cent of

Middle East WHY THERE IS WAR

the land to the Jews. Arab armies which moved in to occupy those parts of the land awarded to them were promptly attacked by the better equipped Zionists, who increased their share of the country to 75 per-cent.

Official hostilities were concluded by an armistice in 1949, but the Zionist bid to grab the whole of Palestine continued in the form of a terrorist campaign by armed gangs, such as the Stern Gang and Irgun Zvi Leumi, resulting in appalling atrocities, including the murder of British servicemen and the wholesale massacre of Arab men, women, and children at the village of Deir Yassin.

A million Arabs fled from their homes. A month after the armistice, Israel seized Elath, the focus of recent trouble.

Every year since 1949, the U.N. has passed resolutions requiring Israel to take back a portion of the refugees or to compensate them. These resolutions have been ignored.

In 1956 by another act of aggression, this time using British and French forces to bear the brunt of the fighting, Israel secured another concession: the opening to her shipping of the Gulf of Akaba, till then an all-Arab waterway.

* * *

During these years the pattern of the Zionist drive for expansion has accorded with the massive build up of Israeli armed strength in the Middle East. Israel has in fact become a far more highly militarised state than Nazi Germany ever was, with every able-bodied male AND female undergoing a regime of intense drill and weapon-training. The idea, fostered throughout the

West, that this has been purely for defensive purposes has been blatantly refuted by the nature of the recent campaign. Despite much talk of 'little Israel', it has been found that Jewish armies, due to the fullest mobilisation actually outnumbered their Arab counterparts, as well as having the advantage in organisation and equipment that comes of years of preparation, along with the financial support of Jewry all over the world. The whole operation took the Arabs by total surprise. It was 'Blitzkrieg' on an unprecedented scale. Are we to believe that Nasser's Arabs, so manifestly unprepared, and facing an adversary of whose peak battle-worthiness their intelligence must surely have known, could actually have been the aggressors?

The fact that this can be so widely believed throughout the world can only be explained by the enormous influence of the pro-Zionist forces upon the international media of news and propaganda, as well as on the actions and attitudes of politicians. Just witness the volume of odium that was accorded to George Brown when, in a fit of childlike innocence, he ventured to suggest that the Israelis should not seek territorial aggrandisement out of the recent conflict!

* * *

The pattern of territorial aggrandisement is in fact plain. By a combination of intrigue and terror, masquerading under the guise of a gallant little 'have-not' nation fighting for its rights, Israel has from the beginning planned the ruthless acquisition of a great Middle Eastern empire, controlling the twin strategic bastions of Suez and the great oil wells without which most of the Western nations cannot live. Where the uprooting and butchering of thousands of innocent Arabs has been deemed necessary to this aim it has been carried out with cold abandon. Land and property have been plundered without a qualm. People rooted there for centuries have been herded out like cattle, and left to starve and rot without the most meagre help from their evictors. In the meantime this infamous saga has met with nothing but the fawning praise and approval of the Western powers who preen themselves with the 'justice' and 'humanity' of their politics.

This is why there is tension in the Middle East and this is why there is war. It remains for honest people to ask themselves why the Arabs have a grievance, and why this grievance will remain for all time that the Israeli state exists.

To such honest people, equipped with the historical facts — as distinct from the ballyhoo of the harlot press, this is an issue over which there can be no further doubt: OURS IS THE GUILT — AND OURS IS THE DUE INHERITANCE.

ISRAELI REICH

Pearl Harbour All Over Again?

FOR weeks now the world has been asking how it came about that Israeli bombers managed to attack the American ship U.S.S. Liberty off the Egyptian coast. The Israelis claim a case of mistaken identity, but the facts, where they have not been suppressed, indicate otherwise.

On the evidence of one of the wounded crew, Yeoman L.V. Brownfield, Jewish jets attacked the ship no less than six times. In addition to this there were two torpedo attacks from boats one of which was observed to have circled the ship at 100 yards range before firing.

ALL THIS TIME THE AMERICAN FLAG WAS FLYING ON THE BRIDGE WITHIN CLEAR VIEW FOR MILES.

Was there a motive for the attack? The American magazine 'Newsweek', certainly not noted for anti-Israeli sympathies, suggested as much in a report headed: "Sinking

of the Liberty — Accident or Design?" It said: "(The Liberty).....carried elaborate gear to locate both Israeli and Egyptian radio and radar and to monitor and tap all military messages sent from command posts to the battlefield.....Washington officials believe the Israelis knew the Liberty's capabilities and suspect that the attack might not have been accidental.....One top-level theory holds that somebody in the Israeli armed forces ordered the Liberty sunk because he suspected it had taken down messages showing that Israel has started the fighting."

Quite apart from this factor, there is the certainty that if the Americans could be convinced that the attack was by Egyptians it would contribute enormously towards the swaying of public opinion in the United States in favour of massive American intervention on the Israeli side. Throughout history the

sinking of ships has been accepted as a 'casus belli'. It was the sinking of the 'Lusitania' that brought the U.S. into the First World War and that of the American Fleet at Pearl Harbour that brought her into the Second. The Liberty operation has been so like Pearl Harbour in every respect that the explanation of Israeli contrivance is at the moment by far the most likely one.

Here again the evidence of members of the crew bears hearing. Several of them testify to the fact that 30 minutes before the attack took place the raiding jets came on a reconnaissance BEARING NO NATIONAL MARKINGS.

Why were there no markings? Why was the ship attacked when its own markings were clear? While no satisfactory answer is forthcoming the blood of 105 innocent Americans is stained indelibly on Israeli hands.



VICTIMS OF ISRAEL'S BLITZKRIEG

THIS SMALL ARAB BOY AND GIRL ARE THE PRODUCTS OF NAPALM BOMBING BY THE 'HEROIC' ISRAELI AIR FORCE AT A TIME WHEN THE MIDDLE EAST WAR WAS ALREADY WON

(not reported in press)



Israel Napalmed Civilians

Israel has been exposed before the United Nations for having made widespread use of Napalm bombs against Arab civilians in the recent war. This bombing took place long after the essential tactical objectives of the war had been accomplished, and by which time it was clear that the Arabs would be defeated. There can therefore be only one explanation for the use of Napalm — so that civilian populations would be terrorised and wiped out in order to make way for further Israeli expansion.

The children shown in the pictures above went through excruciating pain as a result of their being the victims of Napalm, and their faces and bodies will be distorted for life. They are just two among thousands who suffered from the bombing. Scarcely a word about these atrocities was said in the papers.

Israel Violated Cease-Fire

On all sectors of the war the Israeli forces failed to heed the cease fire until all military objectives had been achieved. Israel fought on for two days against Jordan after Jordan had accepted the U. N. cease fire. Only after Israel had captured everything west of the Jordan River did she stop.

The fight against Egypt also continued for two full days after Egypt had accepted the cease fire, and Israel took everything west of the Suez Canal.

The invasion of Syria began only after the Syrians had accepted the cease fire.

200,000 Expelled From Homes

It was 1948 once again. After conquering Arab territory, the Israelis began evicting Arabs from their homes, farms, and businesses.

UNRRA officials reported that by June 14 over 200,000 Arab refugees had poured into free Jordan. Tents and emergency food rations had to be rushed in.

Whole Army Wiped Out?

What happened to the 150,000 man Egyptian Army smashed in the Sinai Desert? The Israelis admitted to having taken 6,000 prisoners. Another 6,000 were seen to cross the Suez Canal. 10,000 were reckoned to have been killed in battle.

That leaves 128,000 unaccounted for.

When asked about these missing men the Israeli authorities were found to be highly evasive. They had already announced their intention to destroy the Egyptian Army. In the words of one daily paper, "do they mean this literally?"

To date the Israelis have given no satisfactory explanation as to the whereabouts of these men, and have refused all offers of British and American help in locating them.

Are we witnessing the deliberate extermination of a people? It is time the truth was known.

Behind the Threats and Violence, a Clue to Political Strategy

RED CHINA—FACT AND MYTH

by
JOHN TYNDALL

RED China's first hydrogen explosion, combined with the quite absurd posturings of her London diplomats, has given rise to nervous speculation throughout most of the world's press. For many years now China has preoccupied mankind with her size and numbers alone. Great stress has been laid on this factor, together with the aggressive postures of the Peking Government, so as to convince many students of world affairs that China is the ultimate menace against which the security of the Western powers must be guarded. Now that there is added to this formidable statistical strength the most lethal of modern weapons it is hardly surprising that we should hear the alarm bells ringing more loudly than ever.

It is therefore a good moment to take a look at Red China. What is the measure of her power, and what implications does this power hold for us?

NUMBERS NOTHING NEW

Firstly, let us remember that China's numbers are nothing new. For countless ages the yellow hordes have been a factor in the minds of Westerners. If 100 years ago the size of the Chinese nation was very much less than it is today, so for that matter was that of the British, American, German, and most other Western nations. In terms of ratios, the balance has not shifted. There were always plenty of Chinese to every one of us.

Yet throughout the many centuries that this has been so, China has never in the remotest way presented any serious threat to the great Western powers.

The alleged threat of China today is based on the assumption that her numbers are now harnessed to the powers of modern industry and technology. What are the facts behind this assumption? China's production of mechanised goods is still well behind that of Belgium, a nation of 9 million people. In motor vehicles in particular the entire annual output of her factories does not even equal the weekly figures of the larger firms of Europe and America. In technological skills reliable sources report that she is still hopelessly dependent on the help of Russian and other East European advisers and overseers. Her latent reserves of coal are the greatest in the world, but her actual coal production is well behind that of the 'big leagues' of the coal industry. Other than in coal, her known mineral reserves are by no means impressive for such a large territory. In petroleum products she is not even a factor at all.

STRATEGIC WEAKNESS

Now that China has the bomb it is claimed that the strategic advantage lies with her, since, with her many hundreds of millions, she can afford to risk enormous losses of manpower which the Western nations cannot.

But a moment's thought will expose the hollowness of this theory. China's population is not a dispersed one. A great part of it lives in areas as congested as the more populated countries of Europe. While China looks large enough on the map, an enormous part of her territory to the North and West is almost empty, leaving most of her people situated in a much smaller area adjacent to her South Eastern seaboard. A well directed nuclear assault on this latter area would go further towards wiping out four-fifths of its inhabitants than any similar assault would go towards eliminating even a tenth of the populations of the United States, the British dominions, or Russia (assuming, as most do, that the latter country would be included in China's coming attack on the world).

And this reckoning assumes, not only an equality in nuclear status, but an equality in the means of its delivery between China and her would be victims. China has hardly begun to develop this latter attribute, let alone the complicated techniques of missile reception. Before her own nuclear devices even got off the ground it is virtually certain that China would have her population decimated to a fraction of its present size and her meagre industrial resources simply wiped out of existence.

The much boosted 'threat' that China is supposed to present to the world therefore becomes quite ludicrous when viewed in the light of the realities of modern war — so much so that it is hardly credible that the world's rulers, with their abundant fund of expert military advice, seriously believe it has any meaning. We must therefore seek other reasons as to why this 'threat' has captured such a prominent place in the verbiage of our propagandists. It so happens that there are plenty if we know where to look for them.

AID TO PROPAGANDA

We know the game of the propagandists only too well. We know that today they are the spokesmen for those powerful vested interests seeking international control of the world by the manipulation of money and thereby of 'public opinion'. We have seen how, in order for the nations to be dragooned into their one-world system, it is necessary for there to be maintained a continual state of 'international jitters', arising from perpetual flare-ups in every corner of the earth, both genuine and contrived. World unrest is an indispensable requirement of the internationalists. Only through it, and the food it provides for their propaganda, can their nationless, raceless utopia be made attractive to mankind.

This unrest requires the continual existence of a would-be 'world menace' by which the nations will feel themselves threatened, and against which they will thereby be willing to surrender their freedoms in the cause of 'collective security' and other internationalist euphemisms.

Phase One of this process found a ready-made bogey: Germany. Both the Kaiser and Hitler created situations in Europe which provided perfect grist to the millers of internationalism. Out of the wars in which they played a part came respectively the League of Nations and its inheritors of U.N.O. and its many offshoots and agencies. Nations were sucked into the International Financial orbit by propaganda which laid stress on their weakness in the face of German 'global plans' — even though there was never any proof that such plans went beyond the acquisition of limited spheres of interest in Central and Eastern Europe.

The Second phase began when World War II ended. Soviet Russia emerged as one of the two strongest world powers, and her behaviour in the early post-war period made it only too easy for an atmosphere of global unrest to be maintained. The 'cold war', with its succession of incidents and crises, set in. After each of these the call became increasingly louder for the nations to merge into blocs of 'mutual interest'. The nations of the Eastern bloc were herded into the Soviet fold on the pretext of the aggressive designs of 'Imperialism' — laughable when it is borne in mind that the latter concept was then being frantically abandoned by one after another of the European nations. In the meantime Communist sabre-rattling conveniently created the conditions out of which internationalism of the Western brand was able to thrive. Using America as their base, the internationalists contrived to bring all the policies of the non-Communist nations into line with that of the United States, which was itself merely the vehicle for their own designs of global control. By playing the two biggest powers off against another in a phony war of nerves deliberately nurtured by engineered 'crises' followed by frenzied propaganda, the internationalists have transformed a world of nations into one of two centrally controlled blocs, representing increasing monopolies of political, economic, and military power. So perfectly have the actions of the one played into the hands of the other that it is far from being a wild statement to point out the likelihood of invisible collusion between the two. International Capitalism combined with the forces of revolution to create the first Soviet State in 1917. Why should not these two entities now be in similar accord? Their quarrels have at worst been lovers' tiffs; their common profit from the upheavals of the modern world has in comparison been vast.

THE FINAL STEP

With the successful regimentation of the nations of the world into these two monopolistic international blocs, there has only remained one phase to be completed; the two blocs must become one, so setting the seal on the design that has shaped world events during the greater part of this century.

With the merging of the Sovietised East and the Capitalistic West the aim of total world control by the international power-elite will become a reality. By what means should this strategy be pursued?

First of all, the propagandists have had to set about remoulding the public image of Russia in the eyes of the West. The diplomatic scowls of the early post-war years have been turned into smiles and handshakes. Summit bonhomie has become the order of the day. While Soviet leaders are generally depicted as 'nice chaps' sharing 'common interests' with ourselves, the Soviet State is presented to us as one becoming increasingly enlightened by 'liberal' principles. The aims that unite Eastern and Western blocs have been made to appear far greater than the issues that divide them. While our press can never let us forget what it thinks of the deeds of the German Nazis, such affairs as the butchery of Budapest — of much more recent event — are discreetly written off as minor teething troubles that the Soviet leaders have now grown out of.

In these ways can the fond embrace of Russia be made to seem an attraction to the nations of the West. But that is not enough; it must also be made to seem a necessity. The same atmosphere of fear that served to internationalise both halves must be recreated to internationalise the whole. A new bogey must be found, for preference a bogey big enough to APPEAR a threat, but not in reality strong enough to BE a threat, to the peoples living under the Capitalist-Bolshevist axis.

CHINA AS A BOGEY

The China of Mao Tse Tung has fitted perfectly into this role.

As frantically as the propaganda machine has sought to impress us with the peaceful intentions of Moscow, so has it amplified every bellicose utterance and gesture on the part of Peking. There is something terribly bogus about the sight of a regime racked with enormous internal problems and only in the infant stages of a technological revolution talking and behaving as if it proposed to 'take on' virtually the whole world. Those who have troubled to read the biography of Chairman Mao will know that beyond all else he is a highly intelligent man, certain to know from the experience of his many revolutionary campaigns just what such an adventure would mean for China. If he fails to restrain the antics of his juvenile 'Red Guards', we should assume that he sees them as tokens in a war against the world that is more psychological than physical. How much Mao is in cahoots with the mind-moulders of the West cannot be proved. What is certain is that if he and they were in hour to hour liaison the effect could not possibly be more favourable to the latter than it already is.

We are being systematically conditioned to regard Red China as a world menace against which any and all measures of international organisation are called for — including the long blueprinted amalgamation of Western and Soviet systems into one total and all powerful world authority, controlled by we know not whom!

The existence of Red China is indeed convenient for those who plot and prophecy our destinies. Were China not to exist, an alternative source of fear would have to be found — one knows not where! Perhaps Mars or the Moon? A little difficult, maybe. But unnecessary as long as there exists in clear outline a dragon as many toothed as Russia, America, and Western Europe combined, whose paper structure can be obscured by nuclear snorts audible to the cowed ears of a fretting mankind.

That is the sum and size of China as this writer sees her. An immobile animal whose bark and aspect is many times worse than its bite. Not a remote threat to the real security of nations such as our own, but an ideal decoy in the face of which the creeping internationalisation and monopolisation of the world can be made to appear justified. The embassy looting, the row with Russia, the pictures of the military parades; all these serve a common aim: the maintenance of nerve warfare and the diversion of public attention from the real trend of political events.

THE REAL THREAT

To those of us who have contrived to penetrate the smokescreen of world politics during this century Communism, whether of the Russian or Oriental brand, has long been exposed as merely a means to an end. The end itself is human enslavement to an international tyranny — as real and as evil when it masquerades under the humane verbiage of Western Democracy as when it functions through the police coercion of Sovietism. It is world-government that we have to fear — not China or Russia as such. The threat to our existence as a nation lies, not in the bombs and tanks of the Eastern Hemisphere, but in the conspiracy of ideas and words that festers in our very midst.

read...

Six Principles of British Nationalism

by
JOHN TYNDALL

Available now through our book-service. Price 1s.

COME AND VISIT

VIKING BOOKS

THE NATIONALIST CENTRE

BIRKBECK HILL

LONDON S.E.21

01-670-0118

Open:-

Weds. 7-10 p.m.

Sats. 2-6 p.m.

Send for Our Free Catalogue **NOW!**

"The New Unhappy Lords"

An exposure of power politics

By A. K. CHESTERTON

Cloth-Bound Edition	25/-
Paper-back Edition	10/6

THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS is a must for the bookshelf of any student of modern politics. It represents the most lucid and startling of all commentaries on the methods of subversion being used to undermine Britain and European Civilisation.

(obtainable from Viking Books)

'BUY BRITISH' CORNER

With unemployment rising at a rate faster than in any year since the war, the need to buy British is now greater than ever. It is our duty to provide work for our own people, and not for Japanese, Frenchmen, Chileans, or Americans. This issue we look at one of the biggest sources of employment in Britain — the cotton industry.


Over the last few years millions of pounds worth of cotton goods have poured into this country, forcing many of our own producers out of business and thousands of their employees out of jobs. It is high time that the Government took measures to halt these imports and thus to lower our balance of payments deficit as well as combat unemployment. But are they likely to do this? At the moment the answer is No.

Therefore we of the public must take a hand by simply not buying imported cotton goods. If you do this it may well help you personally, since the man to whom you give work is very likely one who with more money will buy the kind of goods that you produce yourself.

We have not the space here to list the enormous numbers of firms producing cotton goods in categories of nationality. Your best bet is simply to carefully examine the tag of each item before you buy it to see if it is imported. If it is, make sure to demand from your shopkeeper that he supplies the British product if he wishes you to buy at his shop at all.

PETER HOLLAND

CROSSWORD



ACROSS

- 2 The dreamer some call Uncle Sam (7)
- 7 Ambush (4)
- 8 Smaller island (4)
- 9 Found in the hearer
- 10 A slippery customer, fishy!
- 11 Rebellious tribe not of Carib. origin (3)
- 13 Period of reversed existence (3)
- 15 Little devil (3)
- 18 Legally consenting? (5)
- 19 Cut away (5)
- 21 Variety of mountains (5)
- 23 Line of argument (3)
- 24 Possessive female (3)
- 25 Stranger (5)
- 28 Thunderously striking (5)
- 30 Linking factor (5)
- 33 Roundly incite (3)
- 35 Cobbett said London was the great one (3)
- 36 A pile of banknotes in swaddling clothes (3)
- 38 Stamp out or expire!
- 39 A wee drop (3)
- 41 Inca country (4)
- 42 Sole (4)
- 43 Directionally more than astern (7)

DOWN

- 1 Much maligned Semite (4)
- 2 Tail-less Android (3)
- 3 Sinned (5)
- 4 One agreement that is perfect (5)
- 5 Pertaining to pain (3)
- 6 Environmental part of a slump (4)
- 11 Better (7)
- 12 Marine propeller (3)
- 14 Lamentable French street (3)
- 15 Small part of the Learned Elders (3)
- 16 Flatly folded (7)
- 17 Bedeck (5)
- 18 Forests in your shoes? (5)
- 20 Sooner than before (3)
- 22 In a linear curve (3)
- 26 Wilson spelled backwards or one of his M. P. s (3)
- 27 Southern British river (3)
- 29 The Establishment rule — when it suits it! (3)
- 31 Parts of newer stone (5)
- 32 Unbind (5)
- 34 Vale (4)
- 37 Fit (4)
- 38 Fee directly payable (3)
- 40 Sounds like a heavy barrel (3)

ANSWERS TO LAST CROSSWORD

ACROSS: 2) Arm, 4) Apt, 7) Pact, 8) Erg, 9) Idol, 10) Own, 11) Rod, 12) Germ, 14) Ice, 15) Edda, 18) Social, 21) Damned, 24) Weak-er, 27) Flowed, 30) Ruts, 33) Tar, 34) Coon, 38) Ring, 39) Eve, 40) Road, 41) Air, 42) Red.
DOWN: 1) Race, 2) Atom, 3) Menial, 4) Agreed, 5) Tide, 6) Goad, 12) Gas, 13) Roc, 16) Don, 17) Aid, 19) One, 20) Ilk, 22) Mao, 23) Eke, 24) War, 25) Art, 26) Rather, 27) Farmer, 28) Woo, 29) Din, 31) Unit, 32) Saga, 34) Card, 35) Oval.

The sender of the first correct entry opened by the Editor on the 15th October 1967 will be entitled to any book of his or her choice listed in the Viking Books catalogue. Answers in next issue. Winner of last issue's competition was Mrs. A. Hart, of Leeds.

READ COMBAT

Edited by JOHN BEAN

Obtainable from:—

1 WINDMILL ROW
LONDON, S.E.11

LIVERPOOL NEWSLETTER

A monthly TACTICAL publication for Patriots, with emphasis on local action with specific objectives. The interpretation of the news which the press does not give you, with advice, where applicable, of what to do about it.

Annual subs. 5s. post-free. Six-month trial offer for SPEARHEAD readers @ 2s. post-free. Address: 'Rose Cottage', 17 Hadassah Grove, Lark Lane, Liverpool 17.

ADVERTISEMENT

Right after world war two our political leaders had thrust upon them such colossal power that they needed only the influence of that power to go forth and attack the helpless black-white colonial nations of Western Europe, much as Don Quixote attacked windmills, without firing a shot.

The colonial system was our rampart against the advance of Communism. Our political leaders, flushed by a world power as overwhelming as that of the ancient Roman emperors, quickly attacked it, causing an abrupt transition away from democracy to communism. Our political leaders created a non Anglo-Saxon world, but they failed to create a peaceful world. They eliminated "Pax Britannica", but they neglected to create in its place "Pax Americana". Our political leaders were obsessed by an ancient grudge against colonial nations. The greater the colonial nation, the greater the grudge. This left their grudge against England by far their greatest grudge. Each colony removed from a free world colonial nation created a vacuum into which communism would surge — a bloody verification of this assertion is French Indo-China.

The tragedy and shame of the post war era was not the plight of the primitive tribes which inhabited the colonies of the free nations of Western Europe. It was the enslavement of eighty-two million educated and cultured Christians by the Reds behind their iron curtain and the sardonic indifference to that enslavement by our political leaders. Our political leaders were the unchallenged masters of the world, and should not have tolerated such an atrocity. At that time the Russians had no money and no atomic bomb. Our political leaders had both. Even the strongest and the greatest of the world's colonial leaders was forced to preside over the dissolution of his own colonial system. Down went Sir Winston Churchill and what he stood for; down went our bulwark against the advance of communism.

Our political leaders removed the Suez Canal from the free world and delivered it to Nasser. It was a presumptuous and vindictive use of their power, but our political leaders were not yet satisfied. They removed little Holland's prosperous Asiatic colonies from her, and delivered them to Sukarno, a tool of the Communists. The Communists did not have to subdue the free colonial nations which had stood in their path. Our political leaders did it for them. Our political leaders were out to stop Winston Churchill and what he stood for, and they succeeded. You have to take more than a second glance to see any trace of Sir Winston's Anglo-Saxon traditions, which meant so much to the world, and so little to our political leaders. Our politicians did not know the world of which they were the masters.

Anglo-Saxonism was developed in England — our political leaders attacked it. Communism was developed in Russia — our political leaders let it alone.

The foreign policy of our political leaders was fundamentally "down with the English". The Communists knew this and took every advantage. The post war era presented our political leaders at long last with the opportunity of crushing the British Empire.

Our political leaders had Utopia within their grasp, but their desire to destroy the British Empire transcended all else.

Samuel T. Vann
1619 Beverley Road,
Alberquerque, New Mexico,
U. S. A.

To the Editor

SIR: Miss McNab's letter in your last issue on the subject of Germany prompts reflection on the news that the Labour Party have recently gone to considerable expense to prepare an exhaustive report on the growth of Germany's new nationalists, the N. P. D.

I am sick and tired of Britain's leftists appointing themselves as the guardians of every other country's affairs while showing themselves utterly incapable of properly running our own.

Let Germany decide whether or not it wants the N. P. D. That is its business. The business of our ruling party is to attend to the vital task of carrying out its so far neglected promises to the electorate of Britain.

E. FELL
Bournemouth

SIR: Your magazine would do well to feature an article on the evil propaganda of television in this country. Hardly a programme goes by which does not contain some subtle form of brainwashing. This is certainly true of the highly popular show, 'Till Death Us Do Part'.

Alf Garnett appears as the militant 'right-winger' with all the presently unapproved of views on patriotism, the monarchy, race,

the United Nations, pacifism, long hair, etc. At the same time he appears as the ignorant, uncouth moron, who always gets the worst of the argument and always ends up by looking ridiculous. Very clever! Our youngsters are made to feel that to deviate from modern 'orthodoxy' on these issues is to join the ranks of the Alf Garnetts. To be smart and 'with it' means to be on the side of his weekly adversary, Mike.

Is it any accident that we are breeding a race of 'Mikes' — sloppy young jobs to whom nothing, least of all their country and its traditions, is sacred; worshippers of trends and drivel, and debunkers of every civilised code.

Programmes such as 'Till Death Us Do Part' do more to soften us up for Communism than could any political broadcast from Moscow.

J. D. CAPEL
Axbridge, Som.

SIR: I have read the press reports from your country on the recent killing of American Nazi leader, George Lincoln Rockwell, and find them just as packed with falsehood as our own over here.

I was never a supporter of Rockwell's party because I disagreed with his method of using all the trappings of Nazi Germany. But I did admire him as a man of tremendous personal courage and sincerity, and know from first hand evidence what great personal sacrifices he made for his movement. For this reason I believe that we owe it to him to keep the record straight.

Rockwell never at any time advocated the

liquidation or sterilisation of all Jews, as was alleged by the press. He said that traitors to America, Jew and non-Jew, should pay the normal traitor's penalty; that is all. Nor, as was alleged by one paper, did he 'live well while his men went hungry'. I met him several times and know very well of his austere circumstances. The very fact that the car in which he was killed was ten years old is enough to confirm that.

We may feel that Rockwell was wrong in many of the things he said and did, but at least he has a right to a fair and truthful obituary.

H. L. MEAKINS
Pittsburgh, Pa., U.S.A.

SIR: I was interested to read Mr. Chapman's letter on the population issue.

The only adequate 'birth-controller' that has ever existed is Nature herself. Every progression towards a stronger and more intelligent race has been the result of man struggling against Nature's harsh tests — beginning in the maternal womb and carrying on throughout life. Where survival has not been possible, it has been by the merciful decree of Nature, which has selected the fit for further procreation while sparing the unfit the agony and unhappiness of life in a world not made for them.

Today, by practising artificial methods of birth prevention we are denying life to millions of Nature's elite, while desperately trying to sustain Nature's misfits.

B. CAMPBELL
Aberdeen

More About Greece

Lately the fury of the world's liberals has turned on Greece. Hardly a day passes without lurid reports of 'injustices' and 'brutalities' going on in that country. Recently a liberal panel had the impertinence to discuss on television how the new Greek Government might be brought down by armed intervention from outside.

There seems no doubt that this new Government is taking stern measures to enforce its will. So for that matter are many other governments all over the world at the present time, notably in 'newly emergent' Africa. Hardly a peep is heard from the liberals in protest against the latter. What is it that makes Greece so different? In our last issue we said that the venom being directed at the new Greek regime could well be a guide to its value. Here is a report of some of its reforms. How shocking they are you can decide for yourself.

REFORMS TO PURIFY GREEK LIFE

From report in *New York Times*, 15/5/67.

ATHENS, May 18 — Sweeping changes in Greek education are being prepared by the military junta that seized power last month.

As it has in all matters of social and economic policy, the new regime has opened the campaign with statements of a need to purify all phases of Greek life.

Education Minister Constantine Kalambokias declared that commissions would be appointed to propose the forms of curriculums, textbooks, teaching and student life from elementary school through the university level. The purpose of the reforms, the minister said, is "to form Greek citizens inspired by Greek Christian civilization."

So far, the Education Minister's decrees have proscribed mini-skirts for girls, long hair for boys and have ordered Sunday church attendance and clean living for all.

In a circular addressed to education inspectors last week, Mr. Kalambokias, a Justice of the Supreme Court until the *coup d'état* of April 21, made the schools expressly responsible for supervising their pupils' outside lives. The minister declared:

"Circulation of students late at night, their stay in coffee houses and other suspicious centers and various clubs that are corrupting the soul of youth are inconceivable, just as it is unacceptable for them to go to movies to see indecent films.

"The matter of what students read outside schools is an important one and the schools must face it. Thousands of publications, illustrated or not, silly, indecent and corrupted, circulate and tempt youth, poisoning their lives."

CHRISTIAN NATIONAL CONSCIENCE

In his circular, the Education Minister said "the first and greatest aim of all schoolwork," was "the cultivation of the nationalistic and Christian conscience of students."

The minister, a small man of stern and judicial mien, said the political parties, left and center, had led Greek youth astray, diverting them from their main task.

Instead of devoting themselves to their education, Mr. Kalambokias said, students have become tools of the parties through their youth organizations.

The junta has banned all party youth groups and is giving thought to the formation of a national youth organization. For the time being, young persons may belong only to the Scouts, the Red Cross and catechism schools.

Last week, Mr. Kalambokias ordered all schools to issue a badge with an owl and the name of the school. Students are to wear them at all times, "male students in their buttonhole and female students on their right breast."

In the revision of textbooks, particular stress will be laid on history and religion, Mr. Kalambokias declared. Because Greece is surrounded by Communists and Slavs, the minister said, national survival depends on instilling national sentiment among Greek youth.

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British
Views-Letter

Edited by A.K. Chesterton

Which supports the

NATIONAL FRONT

Published by the Candour Publishing Co.,

11 Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, London, S.W.1

Our readers will be glad to know that the discontinuance of the Greater Britain Movement, referred to on page 4, will not affect SPEARHEAD, which will still appear as an independent nationalist journal supporting the National Front. We have been convinced of the rightness of this policy by the great popularity that our journal has achieved among patriots of all organisations, and by the fact that a movement does not suffer in unity by having the support of various kinds of publications aimed at different sections of opinion. SPEARHEAD will operate, as before, from the Nationalist Centre, and will, we hope, benefit by having contributions from the best National Front writers.

BEHIND THE FACADE

by James Miller

We hear that the Navy has had to hire a boat from a private firm to carry out coastal patrols in the Channel area.

Such is the state to which politicians have reduced what was once the mightiest fleet in the world!

* * *

Apparently the Government is out to suppress a report by Mr. Douglas Jay which says that if we join the Common Market our balance of payments will suffer by £800 million a year, while unemployment will reach over the million mark.

Why the suppression? If Mr. Jay's calculations are wrong, it surely should be within the competence of the Government to produce facts to prove them so.

* * *

Only half of the 100,000 to 120,000 people who apply for admission to universities or institutes offering degree courses this autumn will obtain a place, says the Universities Central Council.

At the same time between 5,000 and 6,000 overseas students will be admitted.

* * *

One unlucky student has been Miss Diana Pearce, who tried for four years to get into one of our medical schools. Despite having all the necessary qualifications, she did not even get an interview. Now she has flown to be trained as a doctor IN PRAGUE!

It has been estimated that last year alone 1,000 would be doctors in Britain failed to get places in medical schools. So much for the tale that without coloured doctors our health service would collapse!

* * *

Latest assessment of the F111, the plane ordered from America for the R.A.F. in preference to our own TSR2: "seriously deficient in almost all categories of flight performance."

Whence the assessment? The R.A.F.? The British aircraft industry? No. The U.S. Senate Investigating Committee.

* * *

It was announced recently that the U.S. has replaced Britain as the main supplier of goods to Australia. Mr. Paul Hasluck, the Australian Minister for External Affairs, has said that his country "has to learn to work, not with the Britain that used to be, but with what Britain chooses to be in the future."

Now that Britain saw her future in Europe, Mr. Hasluck said, Australia would have to make adjustments in her policies.

By flirting with Europe, where we have no future, we are throwing away a great British land thirty times the size of the U.K. whose people have been loyal to us through thick and

thin.

And yet there are still many people, even on the so-called 'Right' who have fallen hook, line, and sinker for the Common Market confidence-trick!

* * *

In Australia itself treason is becoming as rampant as here. Now the Australian Government has announced that it is prepared to grant assisted passages to coloured migrants from Britain. It has not of course asked the Australian people if they want their country to become multi-racial.

If in a few years time Australia becomes the scene of mammoth race-riots no doubt certain people will be well satisfied. It will give them something new to pontificate about.

* * *

We understand that the Government is now considering cuts in the school milk scheme, thus depriving millions of our schoolchildren of what has become an essential source of nutrition.

This at a time when we are sending millions abroad to "help the hungry" in Africa and Asia!

* * *

We understand that the B.B.C. has rejected the plea that the 'Black and White Minstrel Show' be dropped from its programmes because it causes "distress" to coloured people.

We are not really surprised. No doubt the B.B.C. chiefs feel that the shots of 'black' and white couples standing neck to neck makes such good propaganda for race-mixing that the opportunity to continue them must on no account be missed.

* * *

Latest pearl of wisdom from the 'progressive reformers' — "Being faithful is not good for married couples," says Mr. Ian McIndoe, psychology tutor at Sydney University, at a local conference on sex and morality. "Infidelity," says Mr. McIndoe, "could help prevent emotional stagnation."

What is most remarkable: that educated people can talk such claptrap — or that there are enough idiots to provide them with a platform to do it?

* * *

Two Birmingham councillors want to legalise brothels in their city "in order to make things easier for the police".

Why not go further? The burden on the police could likewise be lifted by legalising robbery, blackmail, murder, child-rape, and a score of other pursuits hampered by the reactionary prejudices of the public.

Will we live to see such 'reforms' advocated? Nothing is fantasy nowadays.

* * *

A former Tory M.P. has been dismissed as a prospective candidate for his old constituency because he is not sufficiently "pro-Israel".

Apparently loyalty to Zionism is today a more vital qualification for acceptance in the

Conservative Party than loyalty to Britain.

* * *

A coloured people's association wants to see Mr. Duncan Sandys prosecuted because he opposes further immigration into Britain.

Should such cheek leave us incredulous? Certainly not. Our own willingness to make ourselves the world's doormat is bound to have no other result. The more timidly we behave towards such agitators, the more arrogant they will get.

* * *

In the NEW SCIENTIST of April 27th an interesting disclosure was made.

Speaking on genetic studies, Dr. Wallace Kennedy, of Florida State University, was reported as saying that nowadays government funds for the study of racial differences are only made to bodies in the U.S.A. whose studies are guaranteed to prove that all races are equal.

What is known as 'academic freedom', eh!

* * *

Reported in the DAILY EXPRESS (May 22nd):

"The Government is standing firm on its refusal to accept High Commissioner designate Ali Simbule of Zambia unless he apologises for a speech in which he called Britain a 'humbled, toothless bulldog'."

Mr. Simbule has since then repeated his statement. Nevertheless, his appointment has been accepted.

If Britain is to be judged by the actions of her leaders, we are left with the unhappy conclusion that Simbule's speech went very near to the truth!

Be A Subscriber!

Ensure you always get your copy of SPEARHEAD by placing yourself on our list of postal subscribers. Fill in your name and address below, and send it, with the required subscription, to our offices at:-

THE NATIONALIST CENTRE
BIRKBECK HILL · LONDON S.E.21

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

.....

.....

Copy to be sealed/unsealed.

Enclosed subscription of.....

RATES (12 ISSUES)

British Isles: 17s. (sealed)

15s. (unsealed)

Commonwealth (excl. Canada):

22/6d. (sealed)

15s. (unsealed)

Canada: \$3.00 (sealed)

\$2.50 (unsealed)

U.S.A.: \$3.50 (sealed)

\$2.50 (unsealed)

Others — at local equivalent of:

22s. (sealed)

15s. (unsealed)